DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 286 254 EA 019 556

AUTHOR Schmuck, Patricia A.
TITLE Gender: A Relevant Concept for Educational Leadership.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Leadership; *Research Problems; *Sex Bias; Sex Differences; *Sex Stereotypes

ABSTRACT

Educators' disenchantment with administrative training has prompted a critical reappraisal of the knowledge base used to prepare school leaders. This paper urges the inclusion of the gender concept in discussions of research agenda for school administrators. With gender serving as an effective sorting mechanism for both clients and professionals, one might ask how school leadership will be transformed by paying attention to gender and to the developing scholarship about women. This new scholarship can help determine the psychological and institutional factors deterring women from pursuing administrative positions, disclose sex differences in leadership performance, explain workforce segregation, and develop new critical analyses on leadership. This paper explores "feminist phase theory" as a useful developmental model. The five phases are (1) exclusionary or androcentric thinking (excluding gender and applying generalizations about men to women); (2) compensatory thinking (seeking female counterparts to male success); (3) women as deficient (psychological thinking, or focusing on sex differences and viewing women as exceptions to the male norm); (4) women as oppressed (system thinking, or exploring organizational and institutional processes that treat women differently from men); and (5) the new scholarship (focusing on gender, including women and men as subjects for and objects of study, and offering a corrective and transformative viewpoint). Several research and teaching considerations are summarized. Included are 49 references. (MLH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia A. Schmuck

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED286254

EA 019 556

DRAFT

# Gender: A Relevant Concept for Educational Leadership

Patricia A. Schmuck
Lewis & Clark College
Portland, Oregon 97219

Many educators are dissatisfied with administrative training in the United States. Voices of disenchantment come from the proponents of school reform, from professional associations, and from foremost scholars and researchers in the field, some who have been responsible for developing and implementing administrator programs over the last thirty years (Bridges, 1982; Griffiths, 1979, 1978; Blumberg, 1984; Report, 1987, Murphy & Hallinger, 1987).

The theme of this UCEA seminar -- "A Research Agenda for School Administrators: Where To?" -- echoes the evident disenchantment and is yet another voice calling for a critical appraisal of the knowledge base used to prepare school leaders.

As we consider, "Where To?" I urge us to include the concept of gender in our thinking about school leadership. Schools in the United States are simultaneously the most gender integrated and gender segregated institutions in our

Prepared for the National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration, University Council for Educational Administration, April 24, 1987, Washington D.C.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

society. Boys and girls are equally represented as clients of schools and women and men are equally represented as educational professionals. Yet, girls and boys are separated into classroom lines by sex, they play separate games on the playground, are differentially represented in courses, and graduate with different outcomes. Men and women professionals in education also are segregated by sex; women are the majority of elementary teachers, in high school there is about a 40% female and 60% male representation yet internal analysis reveals sex segregation by subject matter. Men constitute the majority of educational administrators and professors of educational administration (Jones and Montenegro, 1982; Schmuck, 1987) .I am curious as to how gender serves as a relevant sorting category for the clients and the professionals in our schools and how these sorting mechanisms influence individuals and organizations.

I am even more curious about how our knowledge about school leadership will be transformed when gender is included as a concept. In the 1970s and early 1980s, prompted by the activist's drive for equity, there has been a developing scholarship about women. This inquiry has led scholars in a variety of disciplines to raise critical questions about existing knowledge and to redefine the extant theories. New questions and new notions of significance illuminating women's tradition, history and

culture have emerged. The work of Gerda Lerner in history (1979), Jean Baker Miller in psychology (1984), and Jesse Bernard in sociology (1973), to name only a few, is illustrative of this new scholarship. This work is often referred to as "feminist scholarship" or "the new scholarship on women." By paying attention to women as subjects and objects of study, scholars have found that the extant theories are no longer adequate. For instance, Gerda Lerner (1979) says, with regard to history, that "to document the experience of women would mean documenting all of history. They have always been of it, in it and making it (p. 160)." She means, of course, that to include the thoughts and experiences of women within the traditional domain would be to transform the discipline--history could no longer be confined to the public and productive sectors of society. If we include women, who have been part of the private and reproductive sector, we would change the content and methods of traditional history.

A similar phenomenon has happened in educational administration. In the 70s we explored equity in educational leadership asking questions such as: what are the psychological and institutional factors that deter women from assuming positions of school leadership? Are there sex differences in the performance of leadership - do women bring something different to the role of leader compared to men? What are the factors that contribute to sex

segregation in the education work force? As we asked these equity-based questions we began to form new strategies for investigating the process of schooling and to develop new critical analyses on leadership. Texts such as Walker and Barton (1983), Acker (1984), Fenema and Ayer (1984) and Klein (1985) address the transformation of knowledge and provide new paths for study.

In order to answer the question, "Where To?", I will point out how gender has been an excluded variable in our knowledge base about educational leadership and show how gender should be a relevant category for restructuring conceptualizations of school life and leadership. It is a propitious time to raise such an issue. As we attempt to forge useful and relevant concepts to think about schools, there is an opportunity to include variables heretofore ignored -- such as gender and race (see Yeakey, Johnson and Adkison, 1986 for a more complete critique of the exclusion of gender and race in the theory-based movement).

Feminist Phase Theory (Tetreault, 1985; McIntosh, 1983 and Schuster and Van Dyne, 1984) provides a useful developmental model to trace our thinking about gender as a relevant concept in educational administration. The model illustrates how gender is excluded and how it can be included. There are five phases.

Stage 1. Exclusionary or Androcentric Thinking. Women and issues of gender are not addressed. Generalizations about men are thought to hold true for women; men are the

objects and subjects of study. The thoughts, experiences, and behaviors of women are not considered. This stage represents the primary body of literature on the profession of education generally and specifically in educational administration until about 1970.

Stage 2. Compensatory Thinking. Issues of gender are addressed only so far as women's achievements equal men's achievements; in educational history there is the search for the "lost" woman, or studies in educational leadership include an emphasis on the "exceptional" woman - those who have achieved positions in male-dominated areas. The purpose is to find female counterparts to male success.

Stage 3. Woman as Deficient: Psychological Thinking. Issues of gender are addressed to point out the differences in the psychology of men and women that result in social inequality. Females are seen as exceptions to the male norm. This represents much of the literature on women in educational administration in the 1970s.

Stage 4. Women as Oppressed: System Thinking. Gender is seen as the variable by which existing organizational practices discriminate against women. The focus is on the institutional processes and practices which treat women differently from men.

Stage 5. The New Scholarship. The variable of gender, as it applies to both men and women, becomes a primary area of concentration. Research is modified to include women and men as the objects and subjects of study. This scholarship

is corrective: it provides alternative points of view and transforms existing knowledge.

### Stage 1: Exclusionary Thinking

Exclusionary thinking represents an androcentric bias. It assumes that the experiences, thoughts, and expressions of one group of people - men - reflect the thoughts, experiences, and expressions of all human beings, including women. This stage might be called "genderless thinking" or what Peggy McIntosh refers to as "womanless" thinking (1983, p.2). The model of the male is the model for humanity. Thus, educational history, philosophy, policy, research, and even school texts reveal the presence of men and the absence of women. Exclusion occurs in two ways: first, woman is omitted from discussions and the concept of gender is ignored; second, the woman educator is cast within the general cultural stereotypes.

The work I cite in this section is corrective scholarship; the authors point out how the existing theory or research exhibits an androcentric bias. They show how females are excluded as subjects in educational research and how women's contributions to education are not preserved in writing.

Several authors have pointed out androcentric thinking in education. Burstyn's analysis of American educational history texts (1983) and Martin's analysis of Western

educational philosophy (1982) point out that females are excluded as subjects and objects of study from the standard texts and anthologies in education. In social science research, which is used heavily by educational researchers and practitioners, men are the objects and subjects of study.

Particularly of relevance to educational administration has been the contingency theory of leadership.

Shakeshaft and Nowell (1984) describe several leadership studies influencing our views and practices about educational leadership and make the following statement: "Studying male behavior is not in and *of* itself at issue here. What is at issue is the practice of studying male behavior and then assuming that the results are appropriate for understanding all behavior" (p.188). They report findings on five important leadership theories in the educational literature and show that women are excluded as subjects of these theories; when they are included, they provide deviations from the extant theories. Thus women, when they are included as subjects, remain eclipsed from the conceptualization of leadership.

Dion (1985) in a systematic study of Fiedler's Contingency Theory of Leadership Effectiveness, notes that "only a mere handful [of studies] have focused on the dimension of sex" (p. 329), and although Dion does not report research supporting sex differences in individual performance, he does report the concept of situational

favorability may be an "element with an adverse impact on women in leadership roles (p. 335). In the contingency theory of leadership, individual performance is not as much an issue as situational variables, such as expectations of others. I argue that men and women may be more alike than different and given a similar situation, men and women will not differ appreciably in behavior. The fact is, however, that a male and a female educational administrator are not in the same situation on account of their sex. For men and women, there is a different dynamic in the exercise of leadership due to sex stereotypes, expectations and identity with the leader. I flag this as an important issue for research.

We need not draw only from examples of past research and practice, before consciousness about gender, to illustrate exclusionary thinking. Recent examples of androcentric bias are also available. For instance, there is a plethora of books and commissioned reports which call for school improvement. Even in The Nation at Risk which calls for the twin goals of "equity and excellence," although different student attributes are mentioned - social class, race handicappedness, and ethnicity - there is no reference to boy students and girl students. This report, as well as others authored by prominent educators calling for reform, simply ignores the concept of gender as relevant for improving schools despite the last decade of research

and action on sex equity in education (Tetreault and Schmuck, 1985)

The second way that women and girls are excluded from educational thinking is by the use of cultural biases to explain away certain gender-related differences. Gender roles are seen as causative rather than problematic. Instead of asking, why is this a woman's role or why is this a man's role, sex differences are explained by socially constructed gender-based roles. Assumptions about woman's different motivations, life plans, and aspirations are not only heard on policy boards or in the public media, but also in scholarly books and journals about educators. In a corrective vein, Sandra Acker says, "When writers do consider women teachers, they frequently resort to common sense and unsubstantiated assumptions about their deficiencies" (1983, p. 124). The image of spinster teacher or the married woman who has only a halfhearted interest in teaching has not only prevailed in the public eye, it has also prevailed in the literature about educators. Early books which illustrate a cultural bias include Lortie, School Teacher (1975) Lieberman, Education as a Profession (1956), Wolcott, The Man in the Principal's Office (1975), and Etzioni, The Semi-Professions and Their Organization (1969); they all raise the subject of females and "explain" gender-related differences in the work force reasons. They do not explore the concept of gender as a

manipulable variable but rather as a cultural given, thereby perpetuating the stereotype of the woman educator.

Examples of omission of culturally biased thinking are not confined to educational studies; examples permeate the social sciences. The classic Hawthorne Studies (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1966) ostensibly taught us about the human dynamics of the workplace: about power relationships between bosses and workers. A focus on gender, however, would have included the fact that bosses were men and workers were women. Acker and Van Houton (1974), in reviewing this work, suggest that if gender had been included as a variable, we would have a different view of power relationships in organizational settings. Power is not only imbued in the legitimate authority of the boss, but is also carried in the male role. In another example, Horner (1975) questions the psychological studies on achievement motivation because all the samples were based on men; she includes women in the subject pool and thereby creates some new ideas about achievement. Gilligan (1982) addresses the stages of human moral development which were supposedly unvarying and universal. She points out that the data look different when females are included as subjects and she goes on to revise the theory on human moral development. In all these cases the inclusion of gender as a relevant category revises our thinking.

Stage 2: Compensatory Thinking

In 1985 the United States Congress sanctioned National Women's History Week. The United States also celebrates Black History Month. These are special times for celebrating the successes and notable achievements of women and blacks in our country; we must compensate for these excluded from our thinking and form our history. Black studies courses, ethnic studies courses, and women's studies have become a part of many of our colleges and universities and were born out of such a compensatory motive. It was recognized that women and minorities had been excluded from the traditional curriculum and so a special curriculum was added. Little did we know that these courses would lead to major criticisms about the existing methods and content of study. Howe has documented the exponential rise of women's studies courses and programs since the 1970s and traced their attempts to transform the traditional college curriculum (1979).

At this stage of thinking, there is a consciousness that women are missing. In education we have tried to find the lost women in our history or to focus on those contemporary women who have rivaled men, especially in educational administration.

Most studies on educational employment have drawn attention to those few women who achieved positions in the male-dominated role of school administrator. The focus of research in the 1970s was on the careers and lives of those

"exceptional" women who rose through the teaching ranks to become school administrators. This focus is well illustrated by a look at the concentration of doctoral dissertations completed in the 1970s about women in educational administration. Doctoral dissertations are often a good gauge of the contemporary issues in a field and the 1970s marked a watershed for women doctoral students in this field (Stockard, 1980). One hundred fourteen doctoral dissertations were completed about women in educational administration during 1973-79, (Schmuck, 1980; Shakeshaft, 1981). Most of these dissertations were written by women. Although women administrators remain the exception rather than the norm among women educators and administrators, there has been a search for those women who have occupied roles primarily held by men. Indeed, we know more about those few women who are principals and superintendents than we know about the majority of women who populate the ranks of teacher.

The problem with this approach is that, "males are still perceived as the norm... and theories continue to be developed which are derived from and standardized on.... males. There is no consciousness that the existence of women as a group is an anomaly which calls for a broader definition of knowledge" (Tetreault, 1985, p. 367). While we have included "exceptional" women, the definition of our field of study is on men, or on the traditionally derived views on school administration.

Perhaps it is natural that researchers who pay attention to women in education (primarily women researchers) focus their attention on the same roles that have already had a great deal of attention (held primarily by men). Perhaps, however, it reveals a more important fact, what Jesse Bernard (1973) refers to as the "machismo factor" in research. We are guided by our current paradigms - the underlying assumptions about the way we construct the world. Thus, although compensatory models of thinking have enriched our lives, broadened our understanding about what women have contributed to education and clarified the particular problems which face women seeking careers in male-dominated roles, such thinking has not changed the view of the educational world. Women are included but only within the traditional modes of inquiry. The topics and the structure of the inquiry remain unquestioned and unchallenged. One cannot "just add women and stir." The inclusion of women within the domain of inquiry must change the nature of the inquiry.

Stage 3: Women as Deficient - Psychological Thinking

In the 1960s and 1970s in the United States, the focus of research and action, in education, as well as in other fields, attempted to explain gender inequality in the society and the workplace by focusing on the psychological differences between men and women. These studies

concentrated primarily on the differences in the socialization of boys and girls and described the differences between men and women in life responsibilities, career orientations, and life ambitions (Adkison, 1981; Havens, 1980, Schmuck, 1976). Socially constructed gender roles were seen as causative to the differing psychological aspirations of men and women. Women are deficient because they have been socialized differently than men. This focus on the individual has emerged from the general literature on social change as well as from those studying women's issues. Daniel Katz (1983) points out that social psychologists generally have been too preoccupied with individual causation, which has meant that individuals are held responsible for their own problems. Katz says, "the remedy had been to change the defect or weakness in the individual."

The findings from studies on teacher socialization have been put to use. Workshops, conferences, and books are available to help women teachers improve their perceived deficiencies for upward mobility in the educational hierarchy. There are volumes written - in education and in business - to help women "succeed" (Smith, Kalvelage, and Schmuck, 1980). Project Aware, under the sponsorship of the Ford Foundation, developed regional projects to encourage women in educational administration and assisted groups such as Northwest Women in Educational Administration and the Northeast Coalition of Educational Leaders, to help women

prepare for leadership positions and support those few women who manage to aspire "upwards."

Conceptually there is a problem with this approach, it reinforces traditional male definitions of the "appropriate" motivations and ambitions for advancement in education. Women are "blamed" for not having the prerequisite motivations or ambitions. Thus the model for success remains male. We have taken these findings on differences and have tried to eliminate the differences; we have tried to help women fit the male model and have not considered that cultural roles regarding women remain different from those of men.

Pragmatically, there is also a problem with this approach. As we have trained a few women to alter their career aspirations and to advance in the organizational hierarchy using the traditional models of success, we may have lost something important in the process. We may have lost the positive effects of diversity in our educational leaders. Too many women school leaders, because they remain minorities, bend over backward to assimilate themselves into the majority culture. We have helped women become just like the school leaders we already have rather than celebrating their differences.

In one study interviewing nineteen women administrators, we found that women administrators were not equity advocates, they did not want to be viewed as

different from their male colleagues. It should not be surprising that minority members try to integrate themselves into the prevailing culture and will not raise issues separating them from their peers. (Schmuck and Schubert, forthcoming). We may have helped some women "get together and get ahead" but we have not helped women retain some of the best qualities of what it means to be female in this culture. Educational leadership remains "male defined" and that is a loss to schools. We need alternative models of leadership not a repetition of the same old models. Catherine Marshall describes women administrators as "abnormal women" and "abnormal administrators." (1985). The traditional and male model of career advancement and leadership performanced must be changed so that women who proceed on this path are not considered "abnormal."

Stage 4: Women as Oppressed - System Thinking

At this stage in our thinking, we look to the sociology of change. We turn away from the psychology of teachers and instead look at those institutional structures which discriminate - blatantly or subtly - and perpetuate inequality in the workplace. In education, most of the research has focused on the career mobility of men and women teachers and has pointed to the organizational constraints to women's mobility such as: differential grooming and recruitment of male teachers, sex biased preparatory programs and materials, the mentoring and sponsorship of young male professionals by the older established males in

the field, the lack of female role models, different opportunities for males and females to exhibit leadership behaviors, male domination on screening and selection committees and unfair hiring practices. These are among the institutional barriers that discriminate, formally or informally, against women in the profession of education (Ortiz and Marshall, 1987, Schmuck, 1986; Ortiz, 1982).

This is a reform strategy which calls for incremental structural changes in the existing arrangements of educational institutions. As Katz points out, "These changes can be consistent with the nature of the system and can make it more of what it theoretically is supposed to be" (1983, p. 27). The educational system ostensibly should offer equal opportunities for male and female teachers, and most of the policies and laws banning sex discrimination have been aimed at making the system operate more equitably. Title IX, affirmative action, procedures outlined for fair hiring practices, published policies about nondiscrimination, and the establishment of grievance procedures are all examples of institutional practices that are aimed at breaking down the barriers of discrimination in education.

Despite these attempts, the fact remains that the educational hierarchy is basically unaltered and sex-segregated patterns of employment continue. Schools, as institutions, are complex and difficult to change. There

are some who say that they may be impervious to change. The substantial literature on school change indicates that role expectations, norms, established patterns of behavior, communication patterns, power relationships, and individual values all play an important part in changing school practices (Schmuck and Runkel, 1985). The problem is compounded when we add the cultural imperatives and emotional overtones of gender roles. Incremental structural changes are difficult to effect and even more difficult to accurately measure.

The second problem to this approach is that it remains dualistic in its orientation. It dichotomizes male and female experiences and focuses on issues of inequality, primarily on females as oppressed victims. Human experience is conceptualized in dualistic categories; males and females are compared, and the focus is on women's oppression because women have not achieved the accomplishments of men. Gender is only relevant because it shows inequality due to institutional sexism.

### Stage 5: The New Scholarship

Margrit Eichler offers a useful definition of feminist research; it fulfills three functions: 1) it is critical of existing social structures and ways of perceiving them, 2) it serves as a corrective mechanism by providing an alternative viewpoint and data to substantiate it, and 3) it starts to lay the groundwork for the transformation of

knowledge (1980, p. 9). These three elements - criticism, alternative viewpoints, and transformation - are cyclical; each leads to the other. Knowledge is mutable, something that will not pass the test of time.

By including women as objects and subjects of study, we can begin to see how institutions are "genderized". How can gender be a relevant concept in restructuring the knowledge base of educational administration? I offer four recommendations for research and two for teaching.

Research Considerations

I. Gender Differences:

Comment: It is an age-old question: Are men and women more alike than different? Most of the equity research in the 1970s was based on the premise that there are more fundamental gender similarities than differences, and given equal access and opportunity, we would see equity in the educational work place. In 1987, we are again questioning this assumption (see Gilligan, 1982, and Lyons, 1985).

Recommendation: Subjects should include men and women and gender should be a relevant variable in research topics such as:

A. Leadership Performance

Studies of educational concerns, attitudes to leadership, performance of leadership, expectations of followers.

B. Occupational Socialization

What are the important variables leading to sex segregation in the educational work force? Are men and women socialized differently?

C. Institutional Process and Outcomes

Are there differences in school processes and outcomes when the leadership is composed of 1) males only, 2) majority male, minority female, 3) mixed sex, 4) females only? What are the structural effects of same sex and mixed sex leadership teams?

II. Data - Status Profiles

State and national data about the number of men and women in positions of educational leadership is haphazard and inconsistent. (See Jones and Montenegro, 1982; Schmuck, 1987.) There needs to be a reliable source of state and national data on gender in the profession of educational administration.

III. Theory Construction:

As we conceptualize school life, gender segregation/integration should be a relevant concept for consideration. Strategies for school improvement, models for effective leadership should treat gender as problematic, not causative. We should not use sex-stereotyped assumptions to explain the segregated nature of the school world but rather to ask the question, why is the school world gender segregated?

IV. Quantitative/Qualitative Methodologies

As we move toward more qualitative methodologies and the use of case studies, the application of gender considerations is even more pressing. Women school leaders still are "abnormal", this "abnormality" should not be ignored.

Teaching Considerations

1. Critical Reviews of Texts: Be sensitive to considerations of gender. Ask yourself the following questions: A) Are women excluded from the theory or the subject pool? B) Will this material resonate differently to the male and female students in my class? C) Look at the text from a gender perspective, point out sex-bias and problems of exclusion.

2. Raise Gender as a Relevant Concept in Teaching About Educational Administration. Our task as professors of educational administration is to educate researchers and practitioners; we hope to provide relevant and useful constructs and practices. School clients include boys and girls, school faculties include men and women. Psychologically gender is an important attribute in our interpersonal relations. Sociologically, gender serves as a critical sorting mechanism. Students should be sensitive to these issues.

PS#4:UCEA.DOC

## Bibliography

Acker, Joan; Donald Van Houton, "Differential Recruitment and Control: The Sex Structure of Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 1974, pp. 152-162.

Acker, Sandra, "Women and Teaching: A Semi-Detached Sociology of a Semi-Profession." Gender, Class and Education, Steven Walker; Len Barton, (eds.) London, Falmer Press, 1933.

Acker, Sandra, et al., (eds.) Women and Education: World Yearbook of Education, London, Kogan Page, 1984.

Adkison, Judy, "Women in school administration: A Review of the Research," Review of Educational Research, V. 51, no. 3, Fall, 1981, pp. 311-343.

Blumberg, A. "The Craft of School Administration and Some Other Rambling Thoughts" in Educational Administration Quarterly, V. 20, no. 4, Fall, 1984, pp. 24-39.

Bridges, E., "Research on the School Administrator: The State of the Art, 1967-1980," Educational Administration Quarterly, V. 18, no. 3, Summer, 1982, pp. 1-28.

Burstyn, Joan, "Women in the History of Education," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, 1983.

Dion, Kenneth, "Sex Gender and Groups: Selected Bias," Women, Gender and Social Psychology, O'leary, V.; Unger, R.; Wallston, B. (eds.), New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1985.

Eichler, Margrit, The Double Standard: A Feminist Critique of Feminist Social Science. New York, St. Martin's Press, 1980.

Etzioni, Amitai, The Semi-Professions and Their Organization. New York, The Free Press, 1969.

Fenema, Elizabeth; Ayer, M. Jane (eds.), Women and Education. Berkeley, McCutchan, 1984.

Gilligan, Carol, A Different Voice. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1982.

Griffiths, D., "Intellectual Turmoil in Educational Administration," Educational Administration Quarterly, V. 45, no. 3, 1979, pp. 43-65.

Griffiths, D., "Can There Be a Science of Organizations," Research and Thought in Administrative Theory: Development in the Field of Educational Administration, Johnston; Yeakey (eds.), Washington, D.C., University Press of America, 1986.

Havens, Elizabeth, "Women in Educational Administration, The Principalship," National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C., 1980.

Horner, Matina, "Toward an Understanding of Achievement-Related Conflicts in Women," Journal of Social Issues 25, V. 28, no. 2, 1972, pp. 157-176.

Howe, Florence, "The First Decade of Women's Studies," Harvard Educational Review 49, 1979, pp. 413-421.

Katz, Daniel, "Factors Affecting Social Change: A Social Psychological Perspective," Journal of Social Issues 39, no. 4, 1983, pp. 25-44.

Jones, Effie; Montenegro, Xenia, Recent Trends in the Representation of Women and Minorities in School Administration and Problems of Documentation. Arlington, VA., American Association of School Administrators, 1982.

Klein, Susan, Achieving Sex Equity Through Education. Baltimore, MD, Johns Hopkins Press, 1985.

Lerner, Gerda, The Majority Finds Its Past. New York, Oxford University Press, 1979.

Lieberman, M. (ed.), Education as a Profession. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1956.

Lortie, Daniel, School Teacher. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Marshall, C., "From Culturally Defined to Self Defined: Career Stages of Women Administrators," The Journal of Educational Thought, V. 19, no. 2, August 1985, pp. 134-147.

Martin, Jane Roland, "Excluding Women from the Educational Realm," Harvard Educational Review, 52, no. 2, pp. 138-148.

McIntosh, Peggy, "Stages of Curricular Revision," Claremont College Conference on Women's Studies, Claremont California, February, 1983.

Murphy, J.; Hallinger, P., "New Directions in the Professional development of School Administration: A

Synthesis and Suggestions for Improvement," Approaches in Administrative Training, Murphy; Hallinger (eds.), Albany, NY, SUNY Press, 1987.

Miller, Jean Baker, Toward a New Psychology of Women. Boston, Beacon Press, 1976.

Ortiz, Flora, Career Patterns in Education: Women, Men and Minorities in Public School Administration. New York, Praeger, 1982.

Ortiz, Flora; Marshall, Catherine, "Women in Educational Administration," Handbook of Research on Educational Administration, 1987.

Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, The National commission, 1987.

Roethlisberge, F.J.; Dickson, William J., Management and the Worker. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1966,

Schmuck, Patricia, Sex Differentials in Public School Administration. National Council of Women in Educational Administration, Arlington, VA., 1975.

Schmuck, Patricia; Adkison, Judy; Peterson, Barbara; Bailey, Susan; Glick, Georgia; Klein, Susan; McDonald, Scott; Schubert, Jane; Tarason, Stephen, "Administrative Strategies for Institutionalizing Sex Equity in Education and the Role of Government," Achieving Sex Equity Through Education. Klein (ed.), Baltimore, MD, Johns Hopkins Press, 1985.

Schmuck, Patricia, Sex Equity in Educational Leadership: the Oregon Story. Newton, Mass., Educational Development Corporation, 1980.

Schmuck, Patricia; Schubert, Jane, "An Exploration of Women Administrators' Views on Educational Equity: An Issue of Personal and Cultural Identify," Unpublished paper, 1987.

Schmuck, Patricia (ed.), Women Educators, Employees of Schools in Western Countries, Albany, NY, SUNY Press, 1987.

Schmuck, Richard; Runkel, Philip J., Third Handbook of Organized Development in Schools. Palo Alto, CA, Mayfield Press, 1985.

Schuster, Marilyn; Van Dyne, Susan, "Placing Women in the Liberal Arts: Stages of Curriculum Transformation," Harvard Educational Review 34, no. 4, 1984, pp. 443-457.

Shakeshaft, Charole, "Women in Educational Administration: A Descriptive Analysis of Dissertation Research and Paradigm for Future Research," Educational Policy and Management:

Sex Differentials. Schmuck, Charters, Carlson (eds.), New York, Academic Press, 1981.

Shakeshaft, Charole; Nowell, Irene, "Research on Theories, Concepts and Models of Organizational Behavior: The Influence of Gender," Issues in Education V. 2, no. 3 Winter, 1984, pp. 186-203.

Smith, Mary Ann; Kalvelage, Joan; Schmuck, Patricia, Sex Equity in Educational Leadership: Women Getting Together and Getting Ahead. Newton, Mass., Educational Development Corporation, 1980.

Tetreault, Mary Kay, "Feminist Phase Theory: An Experience-Derived Evaluation Model," Journal of Higher Education, V. 56, no., 4, Summer, 1985, pp. 364-384.

Tetreault, Mary Kay; Schmuck, Patricia, "Equity, Educational Reform and Gender," Issues in Education. V. 3, no. 1, Summer, 1985, pp. 45-67.

Walker, Steven; Barton, Len (eds.), Gender, Class and Education. London, Falmer Press, 1983.

Wolcott, Harry, The Man in the Principal's Office. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

Yeakey, C.C.; Johnston, G.S.; Adkison, J., "In Pursuit of Equity: A Review of Research on Minorities and Women in Educational Administration," Educational Administration Quarterly, V. 22, no. 3, 1986, pp. 110-149.